

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7365

LEE ROY KNOWLIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of
Corrections; KENNETH T. CUCCINELLI, II, Attorney General of
Virginia,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior
District Judge. (1:10-cv-00824-CMH-JFA)

Submitted: April 19, 2012

Decided: April 24, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lee Roy Knowlin, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Carson Vorhis,
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Christopher Davies Supino,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lee Roy Knowlin seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Knowlin has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED